REMARKS

Although there is no specific legal requirement to include a summary of the invention, applicant has added a summary to overcome the examiner's objection in an office action dated October 22, 2004. No new matter has been added.

In the office action dated October 22, 2004, the examiner used Lipman to reject claims 23-32 as having been anticipated.

Claims 23 and 29, as amended, recite "a controller, the controller comprising a plurality of look-up engines, each of the look-up engines receiving look-up requests in a round robin fashion." At least this quoted claim feature is neither described nor suggested in Lipman.

Lipman merely discloses a traditional router (see Lipman FIG. 1); more specifically, Lipman discloses:

> The system controller 12 carries out a number of operations in support of the overall operation of the router 10. One operation performed by the system controller 12 is the management of the routing function at the network layer. The system controller 12 maintains a large routing database, referred to as a routing table, which is used to enable the device 10 to make decisions regarding how packets received on a segment 20 or 22 are to be forwarded. The routing table reflects the overall topology of the entire network as known to the router 10. The system controller 12 communicates with neighboring routers in the network to exchange topology-related information so that the routing tables are kept current despite changes in the network topology. Thus for example when a new node is configured on a network segment, that information is broadcast throughout the network to enable each router to update its routing table.
>
> As mentioned, the device 10 uses the information in the routing table to make decisions regarding how to forward a packet. In a manner described in greater detail below, the device 10 arranges the information in the routing table, and distributes the information among the cards 14, 16 in such a manner that routing decisions take the form of lookups in the cards 14 and 16. The system controller 12 is not involved on a lookup-by-lookup basis, but rather continually updates and distributes routing information to enable each card 14 and 16 to perform lookups independently. The lookups are done at a very high rate, so the device 10 efficiently supports a large number of customers having high data rate demands. As part of its routing-related operation, the system controller 12 determines when it is necessary to update the routing information on the cards 14 and 16, and re-generates and broadcasts the information to the cards. The

> information is broadcast in a manner that does not interfere with the lookup operations on the cards 14 and 16. (col. 7, lines 17-50)

This is very different than a controller, the controller comprising a plurality of look-up engines, each of the look-up engines receiving look-up requests in a round robin fashion. Accordingly, claims 23-32 are not anticipated by Lipman.

In the same office action dated October 22, 2004, the examiner used Lipman to reject claims 23-32 as having been obvious.

As described above, claims 23 and 29, as amended, recite "a controller, the controller comprising a plurality of look-up engines, each of the look-up engines receiving look-up requests in a round robin fashion." Lipman does not teach or suggest at least this quoted claim feature.

One skilled in this art would not be lead to Lipman to provide a controller comprising a plurality of look-up engines, each of the look-up engines receiving look-up requests in a round robin fashion because Lipman merely teaches a traditional forwarding table router that includes a single look-up engine. Even when Lipman suggests that his configuration as shown in FIG. 1 is intended to be representative, Lipman's alternative embodiments only suggest:

> (T)here may be different numbers of customer interface cards 14 and/or core interface cards 16. Also, the cards may operate according to other protocols. In some embodiments the separate functional elements shown in FIG. 1 may be physically arranged in other manners, such as for example on a single circuit board. (Col. 7, lines 51-59).

Still there is no motivation or suggestion in Lipman to provide a controller comprising a plurality of look-up engines, each of the look-up engines receiving look-up requests in a round robin fashion. Accordingly, claims 23 and 29 are not obvious in view of Lipman.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

paper, and the amendment/cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment/cancellation.

Applicant asks that all claims be examined in view of the amendment to the claims.

Enclosed is a $120.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 22, 2005

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

ATTORNEYS FOR INTEL
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21032772.doc